

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-4936

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

CHRISTOPHER TIM FLORENCE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. James A. Beaty, Jr., District Judge. (CR-04-497)

Submitted: May 10, 2006

Decided: June 16, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ames C. Chamberlin, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant.
Michael Augustus DeFranco, Assistant United States Attorney,
Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Tim Florence pled guilty to possession with intent to distribute 95.7 grams of cocaine base "crack" and was sentenced to 268 months of imprisonment. On appeal, counsel has filed a brief under Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), alleging that there are no meritorious claims on appeal but raising the following issues: whether (1) the district court complied with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 in conducting Florence's plea hearing, and (2) the sentence was reasonable. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

We do not find that the district court plainly erred at Florence's plea hearing. United States v. General, 278 F.3d 389, 393 (4th Cir. 2002) (stating review standard). The court complied with Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 in conducting the hearing. Next, we do not find that Florence's sentence was unreasonable. United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220, 261 (2005) (stating review standard); United States v. Hughes, 401 F.3d 540, 546-47 (4th Cir. 2005) (same). Therefore, these claims fail.

We have examined the entire record in this case, in accordance with the requirements of Anders, and find no meritorious issues for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel

believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED